

In the Drawings:

Applicant proposes to amend the drawing Fig. 5 by labeling radial 510, and relabelling element 500. Attached is a drawing sheet with Fig. 5 so labeled. Subject to the examiner's approval, please substitute the attached sheet with the drawing sheet previously submitted.

REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-4, and 6-16 were previously pending in the present application. With this amendment, claims 1, 3, 4, 6, 8, 12, 15 and 16 has been amended to more narrowly and precisely identify the subject matter claimed and to overcome the examiner's rejections as discussed in more detail below.

Drawing Objections

The drawings stand objected to initially because elements are indicated as missing, including "radial 510" in Fig. 5, and elements "638" and "732" of Fig. 6. In response, Fig. 5 has been amended to include radial 510. Further the specification has been amended to remove reference to numbers "638" and "732" in Fig. 6.

Further the drawings are objected to because of inaccurate reference of characters "630" and "640" to designate a radial, and characters "520" and "620" to designate a radial. In response, applicant has amended the specification to correct the inconsistent reference to radials.

The drawings further stand objected to because of essential character elements missing from the independent claims. As an example, the examiner indicates that in claims 1, 3, 6, 12 and 15 it is unclear who or what is identifying the centroid, stating it could be the computer or the user. Further the examiner states it is unclear who is performing the associating step associating. In response claims 1, 3, 6, 12, and 15 have all been amended to clarify whether the computer or user is identifying the centroid, and to show that the computer is performing the associating step.

Based on the above amendments and remarks, applicants respectfully request that the objections to the drawings be withdrawn.

Section 112, Second Paragraph Rejection

Claims 1, 3, 6 and 15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph. Initially, the examiner states that the term "data item" is cited in line 5 of claim 1, line 3 of claim 3, line 6 of claim 6, and line 6 of claim 12, but there is insufficient antecedent basis for this term. In response, applicant has amended these claims to change "data item" to "data item having an addressable location." This amendment is believed to more precisely define the term "data item" and to comply

with the specification, such as on page 10, line 12 through page 11 line 2. Further the examiner states that the term "interpolating positions" in claim 3 lines 6 and 8 lacks antecedent basis. In response, applicant has changed "interpolating" to "locating." This amendment is believed to more precisely comply with the specification, such as on page 11, lines 7-13. Based on the above amendments and remarks, all claims of the present application are now believed allowable under 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Conclusion

Based on the above remarks, all of pending claims 1, 3-4, and 6-16 are believed in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of these claims is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this response, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: June 26, 2006

By: Thomas A. Ward
Thomas A. Ward
Registration No. 35,732

FLIESLER MEYER LLP
Four Embarcadero Center, Fourth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-4156
Telephone: (415) 362-3800
Facsimile: (415) 362-2928